

Appin No. 09/113,090
Amdt. Dated November 17, 2004
Response to Office action of September 29, 2004

4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Specification

In view of the objections raised in paragraph 3 of the Examination Report, the specification has been amended as requested by the Examiner to substitute the term "Artcam central processor 2" on page 3, lines 3 and 5 to "Artcard processor 2".

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

We have carefully reviewed the Examiner's objections but we do not believe that the cited documents render the claim as lacking inventive step.

In particular, in this Office Action the Examiner has objected to claim 6 on the basis of Misawa et al, in view of Ishikawa et al and in view of Suzuki. In this regard, the Examiner cites Ishikawa et al on the basis that this document describes a camera system which includes an IC card having a suitable program. The Examiner goes on to state that it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art who will modify the system of Misawa by the teaching of Ishikawa to provide a camera system capable of adding functions to the camera.

We respectfully submit however that this does not lead to the teaching of the present invention.

In particular, the present invention relates to a camera which includes a processor for processing blurred images, with the processing being performed under control determined from encoded cards. In contrast to this, Ishikawa et al does not describe a card which is used to control processing of images.

In particular, Ishikawa relates to a film based camera as clearly set out in column 9, lines 10 onwards. Accordingly, in this camera there is no processing of images in any way. Instead, the encoded card is used to control settings, such as shutter and aperture values and is therefore used in controlling camera parameters when an image is taken. This would correspond to controlling the picture taken in order to avoid taking a blurred picture. In contrast to this, the present invention relates to the provision of an encoded card which can be used for de-blurring pictures which have already been taken.

We therefore respectfully submit that it would have not been obvious to use the technology of Ishikawa et al, which relates to controlling camera settings, in order to provide control programs for the system of Misawa et al. In this regard the system of Misawa et al provides an internal memory for controlling the de-blurring programs, and we do not believe that there would be any urge for the skilled person to consider the use of card technology in processing of blurred images.

Furthermore, in the present invention, the card allows a user to perform de-blurring of images using algorithms stored on the cards as set out on page 3, lines 10 to 20, and as reflected by use of the term "program control" in claim 1. This allows users to perform de-blurring processes which are not otherwise defined within the camera. In contrast, Misawa

Appln No. 09/113,090
Amdt. Dated November 17, 2004
Response to Office action of September 29, 2004

5

et al does not describe allowing a user to define de-blurring programs other than those already pre-stored whilst in Ishikawa et al, the card is only used to define values for existing camera settings. Thus, the invention allows a wide range of de-blurring to be obtained by the user, without modification of the camera, simply by selection of an appropriate card, whereas the functionality of the prior art is limited to adjustment of existing settings.

We believe this distinction is inherent in the requirement of "program control determined from encoded cards" which we therefore respectfully submit is not shown by the prior art.

In view of this, we believe the current claims are novel and inventive over the cited documents.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 6 to 8, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762